



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,264	07/27/2001	Colin P. Britton	0103488-00003	7813

21125 7590 06/18/2003

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP  
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST  
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/917,264

Applicant(s)

BRITTON ET AL.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7-11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lipkin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0049788 A1).

As to claim 1, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration (See page 3, column 2, lines 50-58) comprising:

downloading functionality for effecting information transfers between a first database and a second database (See page 32, column 1, lines 1-38, also see page 12, column 2, lines 30-51),

transferring information (See page 12, lines 30-51, also see page 8, column 2, lines 18-31) between the first database and the second database, the transferring step including at least one of (See figure 17, 5009, shows “first database” represented by “Internet”, 5013, shows “second database” represented by “database”),

receiving information from the first database (See page 2, column 1, lines 39-67, and page 2, column 2, lines 1-6) using a first protocol, and transmitting that information to the second database using a second protocol,

receiving information from the second database (See page 2, column 1, lines 39-67, and page 2, column 2, lines 1-6) using the second protocol, and transmitting that information to the first database using the first protocol (See page 63, column 1, lines 20-44, wherein "second protocol" reads on "XML", also see page 61, column 2, lines 56-67, wherein "first protocol" reads on "SQL").

As to claim 2, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the transferring step includes any of receiving information and transmitting information that comprises any of commands (See page 47, column 1, lines 1-12), queries and data (See page 4, column 2, lines 57-59).

As to claims 3, and 11, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting resource definition format triplets ("RDF triplets"), respectively (See page 61, column 2, lines 56-67, also see page 69, column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35).

As to claims 4, 12, and 29, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35) whose subject comprises any of a literal value (See page 65, column 2, lines 19-30), reference value (See page 61, column 1, lines 18-39) and uniform identification number ("URI") (See page 59, column 1, lines 16-40).

As to claims 5, 13, and 30, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet whose subject reflects transactional information (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35, also see page 14, column 1, lines 32-41, also see page 21, column 1, lines 43-48).

As to claims 6, 14, and 31, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet whose predicate comprises a URI (See page 69, column 2, lines 26-52), such that related data being transferred between the first and second databases is represented by URIs in a hierarchical ordering (See page 9, column 2, lines 43-67, wherein the table shows the hierarchical ordering of the URI).

As to claims 7, 15, and 32, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35) through whose object each related predicate and subject can be referenced (See page 69, column 2, lines 26-52, also see page 61, column 1, lines 18-39).

As to claims 8, 16, and 33, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF

Art Unit: 2175

triplet (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35) whose object is any of a literal or an identifier (See page 65, column 2, lines 19-30).

As to claims 9, 17, 34, and 41, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet representing any of marketing information or an e-commerce or other transaction (See page 3, column 2, lines 60-67, and page 4, column 1, lines 1-5, also see page 58, column 2, lines 1-14).

As to claims 10, and 18, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration (See page 3, column 2, lines 50-58) comprising:

electronically downloading to a digital data processor functionality for effecting information transfers between a first database and a second database (See page 32, column 1, lines 1-38, also see page 12, column 2, lines 30-51, also see page 1, column 2, lines 47-55, wherein “digital data processor” reads on “computer”, also see page 2, column 1, lines 49-61, wherein network connectivity is shown),

executing the functionality on the digital data processor to effect transferring information between the first database and the second database (See page 73, column 2, lines 1-25), the transferring step including at least

receiving information from the second database using the API and transmitting that information to the first database using the first protocol (See page 7, column 2, lines 7-52, also see page 25, column 2, lines 43-51).

As to claims 19, 35, and 50, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising storing the query for subsequent application to the second database (See page 74, column 1, lines 22-43, also see page 25, column 2, lines 43-51).

As to claims 20, and 51, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising applying the stored query to the second database at predetermined intervals (See page 14, column 1, lines 22-29, also see page 19, column 2, lines 1-12).

As to claim 21, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration comprising receiving the query from the first database in the first protocol (See page 25, column 2, lines 43-51, also see page 14, column 2, lines 1-20).

As to claims 22, and 52, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising caching information received from the second database for subsequent application to the first database (See page 74, column 1, lines 22-43, also see page 25, column 2, lines 43-51).

As to claim 23, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration comprising:

downloading functionality for effecting information transfers between a first database and a second database (See page 32, column 1, lines 1-38, also see page 12, column 2, lines 30-51),

storing a query for application to the second database (See page 65, column 1, lines 47-67),

transferring information between the first database and the second database (See page 12, lines 30-51, also see page 8, column 2, lines 18-31), the transferring step including:

applying a query to the second database using an application program interface ("API") associated therewith (See page 73, column 1, lines 50-67, and page 73, column 2, lines 1-25),

receiving information from the second database using the API and caching it for subsequent transfer to the first database (See page 17, column 1, lines 6-16, also see page 25, column 2, lines 41-67).

As to claim 24, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the wherein the transferring step includes transmitting the cached information to the first database using the first protocol (See page 73, column 2, lines 1-25, wherein "first protocol" reads on XML, and wherein "first database" reads on "information server").

As to claim 25, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the wherein the transferring step includes transmitting the cached information (See page 13, column 1, lines 24-40, also see page 36, column 1, lines 64-67, and page 36, column 2, lines 44-48) to the first database as RDF triplets (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35).



As to claims 26, and 42, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the step of transmitting RDF triplets (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35) includes transmitting triplets wherein at least one of:

a subject comprises any of a literal value, reference value and uniform identification number ("URI") (See page 64, column 2, lines 1-6, also see page 65, column 2, lines 16-30),

a predicate comprises a URI such that related data being transferred between the first and second databases is represented by URI's in a hierarchical ordering (See page 9, column 2, lines 43-67, wherein the table shows the hierarchical ordering of the URI),

an object relates a predicate and subject comprising any of a literal or identifier (See page 65, column 2, lines 19-30).

As to claims 27, and 36, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the steps of receiving and transmitting information using the first protocol includes receiving and transmitting an RDF triplet whose subject reflects transactional information (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35, also see page 14, column 1, lines 32-41, also see page 21, column 1, lines 43-48).

As to claim 28, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein at least one of the databases stores data other than as RDF triplets (See page 71, column 1, lines 6-16).

As to claim 37, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the step of reducing redundancies includes combining related triplets into bags (See page 19, column 2, lines 14-22, wherein “bags” reads on “container”, also see page 66, column 1, lines 10-21).

As to claim 38, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the step of reducing redundancies includes determining a confidence level that two or more triplets represent redundant information (See page 71, column 1, lines 27-67, and page 71, column 2, lines 1-25).

As to claims 39, and 43, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration comprising

storing, in a data store, RDF triplets representing transactional information received from each of a plurality of databases (See page 69 column 2, lines 54-67, and see page 70, column 1, lines 24-35, also see page 14, column 1, lines 32-41, also see page 21, column 1, lines 43-48),

generating a directed graph from the RDF triplets (See page 63, column 1, lines 64-67, and page 63, column 2, lines 1-9),

parsing the directed graph and presenting therefrom information from one or more of the databases (See page 70, column 2, lines 35-67, also see page 71, column 2, lines 5-25) .

As to claim 40, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising the step of generating the directed graph in response to a query (See page 63, column 1, lines 64-67, and page 63, column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 44, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the parsing step includes parsing the directed graph and presenting therefrom consolidated information plural ones of the of the databases (See page 63, column 1, lines 64-67, and page 63, column 2, lines 1-47).

As to claims 45, and 47, Lipkin et al. discloses wherein the presenting step includes presenting the information on a web browser (See page 37, column 1, lines 14-15).

As to claim 46, Lipkin et al. discloses a digital data processing method for enterprise application integration (See page 3, column 2, lines 50-58) comprising generating a query, applying the query to a plurality of databases using a respective application program interface ("API") associated with each of them (See page 73, column 1, lines 50-67, and page 73, column 2, lines 1-12, also see page 74, column 1, lines 32-43),

transmitting information received from the databases using the respective APIs to a data store in the form of RDF triplets (See page 62, column 1, lines 44-67, also see page 64, column 1, lines 4-18),

generating a directed graph from the RDF triplets (See page 63, column 1, lines 64-67, and page 63, column 2, lines 1-9), parsing the directed graph and presenting therefrom information from one or more of the databases (See page 62, column 1, lines 39-67, and page 62, column 2, lines 1-3).

As to claim 48, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising generating the query based on user input (See page 2, column 1, lines 49-61).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 49, Lipkin et al. discloses comprising generating the query based on user input in a web browser (See page 2, column 1, lines 49-61).

### *Conclusion*

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferguson (U.S. Pub. 2002/0178232) teaches a method of background downloading f information from a computer network.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,264

Page 12

Art Unit: 2175

Neveen Abel-Jalil

June 6, 2003



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100